

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application.

In response to the Amendment filed August 7, 2003, the Examiner maintained the previous claim rejection. The status of the claims is the following.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by previously-cited Ghislain Bossut et al. (US 6,195,101, hereafter "Ghislain Bossut"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection with the following comments.

Applicant submits that Ghislain Bossut fails to teach or suggest displaying a crop boundary with a reference point on an image to synthesize on a screen, upon selecting a template having at least a frame, the crop boundary having a corresponding shape to that of the frame of the selected template and being variable in size while keeping the same shape and being centered on the reference point. Applicant argued this point in the Amendment filed August 7, 2003. In the "Response to Arguments," the Examiner argues that the reference discloses user-defined cropping containing geometric parameters. The Examiner contends that

Geometry is defined in the mathematics of the properties, measurement, and relationships of points, lines, angles, surfaces, and solids, therefore it is inherent that geometric parameters would constitute those parameters that define the mathematics of the properties, measurement, and relationships and include points, lines, angles, surfaces and solids.

However, this aspect of geometry is simply a general assertion about geometric properties, which does not correspond to any of the claimed features of claim 1 of Applicant's invention. Thus, even if the Examiner's contention about geometry is correct, Ghislain Bossut still fails to teach or suggest displaying a crop boundary with a reference point on an image to

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U. S. Application No. 09/873,388

synthesize on a screen, upon selecting a template having at least a frame, the crop boundary having a corresponding shape to that of the frame of the selected template and being variable in size while keeping the same shape and being centered on the reference point.

The Examiner further contends that the reference discloses that in order to render a desired portion of the image, it is necessary to apply the equation at the points that correspond to the desired portion (col. 6, lines 61-67), thus constituting a reference point. However, the points (x,y) referred to in the cited excerpt are just coordinate points in a grid, which are not disclosed as having the features recited in claim 1 of Applicant's invention. In particular, claim 1 recites displaying a crop boundary with a reference point on an image to synthesize on a screen, upon selecting a template having at least a frame, the crop boundary having a corresponding shape to that of the frame of the selected template and being variable in size while keeping the same shape and being centered on the reference point. Despite the Examiner's assertions, Ghislain Bossut simply fails to disclose a crop boundary with a reference point, the crop boundary being centered on the reference point. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Ghislain Bossut.

Furthermore, claims 2-4 are not anticipated, at least because of their dependence from claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, the Examiner argues in the Response to Arguments that a grid point in the reference corresponds to the claimed reference point recited in claim 2. However, an individual grid point in Ghislain Bossut is not located inside a crop boundary at a constant position relative to the crop boundary. For example, if a crop boundary in the reference were to be moved, the grid point would not be moved. Thus, the location of the grid point would change

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U. S. Application No. 09/873,388

relative to a crop boundary that had been moved. Hence, claim 2 is not anticipated by Ghislain Bossut for this additional reason.

Applicant submits that claims 5 and 7 are allowable for reasons analogous to those presented above for claim 1.

Claims 8-12 are allowable over Ghislain Bossut, at least because of their dependence from claim 7.

With further regard to claim 5, Applicant argued in the August 7 Amendment that Ghislain Bossut fails to disclose displaying a crop boundary with a reference point on the image on the screen, upon designating a frame size, the crop boundary having an equal aspect ratio to that of the designated frame size and being variable in size while keeping the same aspect ratio and being centered on the reference point. In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, the Examiner refers to col. 11, lines 1-19 of the reference as allegedly disclosing the above-described features. As asserted by the Examiner, the cited excerpt of the reference discloses that "the zone of interest cannot be positioned or reduced in size beyond the point where the image frame would no longer encompass the cutout frame." Col. 11, lines 13-16. However, this disclosure does not mean that the crop boundary has an equal aspect ratio to that of the designated frame size. For example, the zone of interest could have a different aspect ratio than the cutout frame and still have the image frame encompass the cutout frame. Actually, all of the examples of the zone of interest 460 shown in FIG. 4 of the reference illustrate the zone of interest 460 having a different aspect ratio than the image cutout frames 420, 430, 440, and 450. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 5 is not anticipated by the reference for this additional reason.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U. S. Application No. 09/873,388

Also, with further regard to claim 9, Applicant argued that Ghislain Bossut does not teach or suggest a display device that displays samples of different kinds of templates on a screen in a small size before one of the templates is selected. In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner refers to FIG. 5 and col. 12, lines 6-9 of the reference as allegedly disclosing this feature of the claim. Although FIG. 5 illustrates the interrelationship between LivePixObjects, templates, and Template Contexts for three different templates, FIG. 5 and col. 12, lines 6-9 do not disclose that samples of different kinds of templates are displayed on a screen in a small size before one of the templates is selected. Therefore, claim 9 is not anticipated for this additional reason.

Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable over Ghislain Bossut for reasons analogous to those presented above in relation to claim 5.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 10, 2004